

REMARKS

Claims 1-42 stand rejected. Claims 2,3, 8-14, 16,17, 22-28, 30,31, and 36-42 are hereby canceled. Claims 1, 15, and 29 are hereby amended. Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the claims and consideration of the following remarks.

Defective Oath/Declaration

The Oath/Declaration on file with the subject application relates to the original Oath/Declaration filed with the parent of the subject application. According to 37 C.F.R. §1.63(d)(1), a newly executed oath or declaration is not required in a continuation application. The Oath/Declaration included with the application must identify the application to which it is directed. In this case, the Oath/Declaration indicates the title of the parent application. Page 2, paragraph 1 of the Specification relates the instant application to the parent application. Therefore, the Oath/Declaration is not defective because it correctly identifies the application to which it is directed.

Claim Rejections Based Upon 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Independent claim 1 requires retrieving a network shell for the user from a user access profile for the user from an access database wherein the network shell is customized for the user, selecting an alias selection from a graphically presented network shell, and processing the alias selection to execute an action associated with the alias selection. Advantageously, claim 1 provides for an externally administered network shell accessible to a user based upon the user profile. Furthermore, claim 1 provides a network

shell customized based on the user profile (Specification, pages 20-23). In contrast, Nolan discloses navigator modules customized by a service provider for every customer to access. The layout and function of the navigator module changes based on the service provider, not based on the individual customer (Nolan, col.3, lines 10-25).

Independent claim 1 also recites receiving an alias selection from the user into the access server for a network shell that includes alias selections associated with actions. Importantly, claim 1 provides for the access server to associate the alias selections with actions. In contrast, Nolan provides a prior art system that relies upon local processing at the user's device to translate alias into network commands (Nolan, col. 2, lines 8-18). By the method of claim 1, a user can access a network utilizing various devices yet still enjoy customized aliases stored in the user profile because the access server associates the aliases with actions rather than the network device.

Independent claims 15 and 29 contain similar limitations to claim 1 and are allowable for the same reasons. Dependent claims 4-7, 18-21, and 32-35 each contain limitations that render them separately allowable over the art of record. However, applicant forgoes such a discussion for the sake of brevity.

CONCLUSION

The claims in their present form are allowable over the art of record. Applicant therefore solicits their allowance. Any fees in addition to those submitted may be charged to deposit account 21-0765.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12-11-03

**SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER**

Stephen S. Roche, Reg. No. 52,176
Duft Setter Ollila & Bornsen LLC
Telephone: (303) 938-9999 ext. 15
Facsimile: (303) 938-9995

Correspondence address:

CUSTOMER NO. 28004

Attn: Harley R. Ball
6391 Sprint Parkway
Mailstop: KSOPHT0101-Z2100
Overland Park, KS 66251-2100